REMARKS:

In accordance with the foregoing, the claims 1, 5, 9, 16, 18-20 and 26 have been amended. Claims 10, 15, 17and 21 remain cancelled, and new claim 27 has been added. Claims 1-9, 11-14, 16, 18-20 and 22-27 are pending and under consideration. No new matter has been added. The outstanding rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b):

Claims 1-8, 18-19 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lichtenstein.

Lichtenstein discusses providing a lecturer with a means for focusing attention on, and enhancing description of, projected graphics. Lichtenstein provides icons (i.e., a pointing arrow, a label, etc.) that can be selected by a lecturer to be superimposed on the projected graphics to aid the lecturer in explaining the projected graphics (see, col. 7, lines 23-34). For example, as shown in FIG. 10A, a mathematical equation is highlighted from a projected graphics display of a sine wave. That is, Lichtenstein is directed to indicating a particular portion of a projected graphics by superimposing icons onto the particular portion of the projected graphics.

Further, the Examiner indicates that margin 19a (area displaying a plurality of icons) and 19b (area displaying a plurality of control button) in FIG. 9A of Lichtenstein define two separate operation modes. However, Lichtenstein even if the margin 19a (area displaying a plurality of icons) or margin 19b (area displaying a plurality of control button) in FIG. 9A of Lichtenstein is touched, a marker is not displayed in the touched area. That is, control corresponding to the touched area is only executed.

In contrast, the present invention implements a first mode according to which a control instruction is executed without displaying a marker indicative of a detection of a touch in the touch position, and implements a second mode according to which the marker indicative of the detection of the touch in the touch position is displayed without executing the control instruction. That is, the present invention switches between displaying a marker indicative of a touch operation in one mode and executing a function corresponding to the touch operation without displaying the marker in another.

As recited in independent claims 1, 5, 18, 19 and 26 as amended, the present invention provides, "a first mode... settable to provide a first function corresponding to the touch operation including a touch position without displaying a marker indicative of a detection of a touch in the

touch position if the touch operation is detected on said operation screen unit" and "a second mode is settable to provide a second function of displaying the marker indicative of the detection of the touch in the touch position if the touch operation is detected on said operation screen unit, without executing the first function corresponding to the touch operation including the touch position" ("execution mode" and "display mode" in claim 5).

Lichtenstein does not teach or suggest, one mode that executes a function or a command of a touch operation "without displaying a marker indicative of a detection of... the touch position" and another mode that displays "the marker indicative of the detection of... the touch position", as recited in claims 1, 5, 18, 19 and 26.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Lichtenstein.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from independent claims 1, 5, 18, 19 and 26 are patentably distinguishable over Lichtenstein. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claims 3 and 7, "said first display control unit executes the control so that the information is exclusively displayed on any one of said display device or said operation screen unit". The Lichtenstein method does not teach or suggest a display control causing "information [to be] exclusively displayed on any one of said display device or said operation screen unit".

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 9, 11-14, 16, 20, 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of two or more of the following: Lichtenstein, U.S. Patent No. 5,528,263 (Platzker), U.S. Patent No. 5,448,263 (Martin).

The Examiner acknowledges that Lichtenstein does not teach or suggest an information processing system executing an operation in relation to a predetermined time period, thus relies on Platzker as teaching the same. However, Platzker discusses directly interacting with a projected video image without the need for an active computer input device. In Platzker, a sensor captures a series of frames of a projected image and detects whether a user has pointed to the projected image by reviewing the captured frames (see, col. 7, lines 30-40 and FIG. 4). Then, if the user keeps pointing at the same location for a predetermined period of time, a pop up menu window is projected or displayed (see, col. 9, lines 5-10). Thus, Platzker is limited to detecting the presence of an object in captured frames of a projected image and displaying a

menu when the object remains present over a predetermined period of time.

Further, the Examiner relies on Martin as teaching another display device. However, Martin is directed to a conference type scenario where users at various locations communicate touch commands applied to a local touch screen to each other (see, col. 4, line 51 through col. 5, line 4).

Independent claims 9, 16 and 20 recite, executing a function or executing a normal command corresponding to an operator's "without displaying a marker indicative of a detection", and "displaying the marker" for "a predetermined time without executing the function [normal command] ". The references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest executing a function or executing a normal command corresponding to an operator's "without displaying a marker indicative of a detection", and "displaying the marker" for "a predetermined time without executing the function [normal command]", as recited in claims 9, 16 and 20.

For at least the same reasons, claims dependent on claims 9, 16 and 20 are allowable over the cited references.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 27 recites that the present invention "switchably" processes information of a touch operation having a touch position, where "a first mode executes a function in relation to the touch operation without displaying a marker indicative of a detection of the touch position of the touch operation when the touch operation is detected, and a second mode displaying the marker indicative of the detection of the touch position of the touch operation without executing the function of the touch operation".

It is respectfully submitted that new claim 27 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge

the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4-28-05

By: _____

John C. Garvey
Registration No. 28,607

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501